



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

bankrupt, and the lessor leased the premises to another at a lower rent than that reserved, and filed a claim against the bankrupt's estate for the difference. *Held*, that the claim is not provable in bankruptcy. *Matter of Roth & Appel*, 24 Am. B. Rep. 588 (C. C. A., Second Circ.). *Held*, that the claim is provable. *In re Caloris Mfg. Co.*, 179 Fed. 722 (Dist. Ct., E. D. Pa.).

Under section 63a of the Bankruptcy Act of 1898, debts may be proved which are "(1) a fixed liability, . . . absolutely owing at the time of the filing of the petition; . . . (4) founded upon a contract." What contingent claims are provable in bankruptcy is still unsettled. See 23 HARV. L. REV. 636. Claims for unaccrued rent, however, are incapable of being proved. *Watson v. Merrill*, 136 Fed. 359; *In re Mahler*, 105 Fed. 428. Regarding the claim in the present case as one of indemnity for loss of rent, it would be desirable to allow it to be proved, for the bankrupt would be thereby released from future liability and the lessor protected. But by the accepted construction of the Bankruptcy Act, the first and fourth clauses of section 63a must be taken together, and the debt founded upon a contract must be a fixed liability absolutely owing at the time of the filing of the petition. *In re Adams*, 130 Fed. 381. Hence the claim should not be provable.

CONFLICT OF LAWS — MAKING AND VALIDITY OF CONTRACTS — WHAT LAW GOVERNS INDORSEMENT. — A note made by a husband, payable to the order of his wife, was indorsed by her for his accommodation and delivered by him in New York. The note was dated and payable in New Jersey. *Held*, that the law of New Jersey governs the validity of the indorsement, and that there can be no recovery from the wife. *Basilea v. Spagnuolo*, 77 Atl. 532 (N. J., Sup. Ct.).

A married woman cannot be held as an accommodation indorser in New Jersey. GEN. STAT. N. J., TIT. MARRIED WOMEN, § 26. But the capacity of a married woman to contract depends on the law of the place where the contract is made. *Milliken v. Pratt*, 125 Mass. 374. A contract of indorsement is made where the note is delivered. *Briggs v. Latham*, 36 Kan. 255; *Stubbs v. Colt*, 30 Fed. 417. Even when the note is payable at a particular place the contract of indorsement, being a distinct contract from that of the maker, is made where delivery is made and is governed by the laws of that place. STORY, CONF. OF LAWS, 8 ed., § 315. In the principal case, therefore, the contract of indorsement was made in New York, and by the law governing the capacity of married women there the defendant was liable. N. Y. CONSOL. LAWS, 1909, c. 19, § 51. The decision is therefore erroneous, unless it can be sustained on the ground that a contract valid in New York will not be enforced by the New Jersey courts if it is condemned by the positive law of the state, or inconsistent with the public policy thereof as declared by the legislature. *Thompson v. Taylor*, 65 N. J. L. 107.

CONFLICT OF LAWS — PERSONAL JURISDICTION — JURISDICTION TO AWARD THE CUSTODY OF CHILDREN. — A woman obtained a divorce from her husband in Connecticut, and was given the custody of their children. Afterwards she went with them to Germany, intending to make her home there. Some years later, at the petition of the father, the decree for the custody of the children was modified so as to require the mother to send them to the father every year for a visit. *Held*, that this modification is proper. *Morrill v. Morrill*, 77 Atl. 1 (Conn.). See NOTES, p. 142.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW — MAKING AND CHANGING CONSTITUTIONS — MATTER APPROPRIATE FOR CONSTITUTION. — The Missouri constitution provides for the initiation of constitutional amendments by popular petition. The Secretary of State refused to file a petition for an amendment fixing legislative districts for ten years. *Held*, that he need not file the petition, (1) be-